

BULGARIA
BEFORE
THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY
OF THE U.N.

HX
632
A1
W9
NO. 84

SOFIA, NOVEMBER 1948

BULGARIA
BEFORE
THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY
OF THE U.N.

SOFIA, NOVEMBER 1948

Ex libris
UNIVERSITATIS
ALBERTAENSIS



LIBRARY
UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

A FULLY QUALIFIED U. N. CANDIDATE

By

VASIL KOLAROV

Foreign Minister

¹ Declaration made before the
French newspaper *Le Monde* of October 17, 1945

Bulgaria's request for admission to UN is based on Art. 4 of the United Nations Charter which says: «Membership in the United Nations is open to all other peace-loving states which accept the obligations contained in the present Charter and, in the judgment of the Organization, are able and willing to carry out these obligations».

Besides Bulgaria, ten other countries have formulated similar requests. Among them figure the following European countries: Italy, Rumania, Hungary, Austria, Portugal, Finland, Ireland and Albania. Thus, a great number of European countries still remain outside the fold of the UN, knocking on its door for admission. One may justly ask oneself: Is Europe, represented both incompletely and inexactly, capable of playing the role it should? The emphasis should be put here on the

profound political transformations which occurred in a number of European countries in the wake of World War II.

Confining myself to the question of my country's admission to UN, I wish, before all, to recall the peace-loving character of the People's Republic of Bulgaria, established after the overthrow of the monarcho-fascist regime by popular revolt under the guidance of the Fatherland Front. This peace-loving character can not and should not be open to doubt. On this point, the opinion of observers of all shades, statesmen, writers, scientists or artists, who have visited our country, is practically unanimous. They affirm that Bulgaria is a peace- and freedom-loving country, wholeheartedly dedicated to the building of its democracy.

As a matter of fact, at the very moment when certain neighboring

countries are spending tremendous sums on building up their armies, both in material and men, Bulgaria has cut down the number of its troops to the size fixed by the Peace Treaty and reduced its military expenses to the minimum. Today the Bulgarian army is instructed and organized solely for the defence of the territorial integrity and national independence of the country.

The Bulgarian people who are now masters of their own destinies have completely devoted themselves to a peaceful cause. They are working in towns and villages in order to remove the war scars, to modernize the country's backward economy and to carry out the social and economic reforms and understandings which will guarantee to the workers material welfare and cultural progress. During this summer, to mention but one instance, 250,000 young men and women voluntarily and without any remuneration participated in the great building enterprises.

Is it difficult to understand that such a peaceful building activity as the carrying out of vast irrigation projects, the establishment of electric stations, the creation of railway and road nets, the construction of plants for artificial fertilizers and agricultural machines etc., is incompatible with a policy of hatred among peoples, with a policy of war and

aggression? The Bulgarian people need a lasting peace, they need the assistance of economically powerful countries. Hence the policy of the Bulgarian Government is a policy of friendship and collaboration with all nations which respect our country's independence and are ready to deal with it on a basis of equals. This love of peaceful and creative work explains the Bulgarian people's concern about the chaos, anarchy and civil war raging in our southern neighbor.

As to the political maturity of the Bulgarian people, I consider it an offence to have to prove that the People's Republic of Bulgaria, which zealously watches over its national sovereignty, will be able to fulfill the obligations which the Charter of the United Nations imposes on its members.

It is strange that more than one year after the entering into force of the Peace Treaty signed by Bulgaria, its request for admission to the UN should not yet have been fulfilled. It is stranger still that all opposition to this request stems precisely from those countries which at the signing of the Peace Treaty had pledged to support it.

Two arguments are invoked to motivate this opposition.

The first is directed against the regime of people's democracy which

was established in Bulgaria. It would be very easy for me to refute here categorically all slanders and other false information circulating abroad about the situation and events in Bulgaria. It would also be easy for me to show up the true face of certain nations, members of the UN, which boast of their «democracy». But this is an internal question which is not mentioned in Article 4 of the Charter. I shall therefore withhold from any polemics on this subject. However, I wish to remind you that a number of states whose regime is similar to that of Bulgaria are members of the UN.

The second argument consists of a simple assertion: my country, it is avered, does not respect the Peace Treaty and does not submit to the UN decisions. With a perseverance worthy of a better cause, Bulgaria is accused of not having fulfilled the military clauses of the Peace Treaty pertaining to the reduction of military effectives. This is a groundless accusation which was categorically refuted by the Minister of National Defense who made a detailed exposé on the subject before the Grand National Assembly. It should be noted that the Bulgarian Government has not yet received any notification regarding the non-execution of the Treaty, in conformity with the provisions of the Treaty; this does not prevent those

who are ostensibly rearming and threatening the world with atomic bombs from portraying our insignificant army as a force menacing the freedom and independence of other peoples.

All this would be ludicrous, did it not serve the dark aims of the fomentors of a new war.

Hence, the only accusation that remains is the assertion that Bulgaria is not observing the UN decisions. The Bulgarian Government has not ceased to declare that it would fully adhere to the principles proclaimed by the Charter. The treaties of friendship and others which it has concluded are based on the principles of the United Nations. When Bulgaria will be admitted to the UN and will have a possibility to take an active part in its work, it goes without saying that it will submit to the decisions which this organization will take in conformity with the Charter. But it is contrary to all notions of justice to accuse Bulgaria of not executing the UN decisions when it is kept outside it. Bulgaria is neither a colony nor a country under foreign tutelage. It insists on being treated as a sovereign nation. It is in this spirit and in compliance with the UN Charter that Bulgaria requests to be admitted to UN as a regular member.

OUR STAND ON THE GREEK PROBLEM

Speech delivered by the Bulgarian Minister Plenipotentiary to Paris, Professor Todor Vladigerov at the session of the UN Political Committee on October 29th, 1948, on Bulgaria's attitude towards the Greek problem.

The Bulgarian Government has examined carefully the report of the UN Special Commission for the Balkans (UNSCOB) of June 30th, 1948, as well as its supplementary report, both of which were submitted to the General Assembly of the U. N.

Before broaching the subject-matter of these reports, I would like to make a rather important preliminary remark. The Bulgarian Government is surprised at the majority decision of the Commission which hindered it from expounding and defending its attitude on the Greek problem. The Commission refused to grant this right to a government which is directly interested in the question and against which serious and unjust accusations have been formulated. No-

which contains grievous offenses at the address of an independent and sovereign state. Bulgaria has in no way deserved such an injustice and discrimination. Such mode of action thing could warrant this decision leaves the impression that the question has been prejudged, before being investigated and that sentences are being passed without any discussion of the available data.

However, conscious of its duty towards its country and imbued with the desire to help clarify the problem discussed by the Political Committee, the Bulgarian delegation has deemed it necessary to expound the viewpoint of its Government, insofar as it is enabled to do so.

The two reports of UNSCOP contain certain accusations against Bulgaria, accusations which were re-

peated here by some delegates as already established facts. As a matter of fact, as I shall point out in my exposé, such inferences cannot be drawn from the data in the UNSCOB reports, and still less from the objective facts.

In the first place, UNSCOB accuses Bulgaria of having lent aid to the Greek partisans and as a proof it makes the most of the existence and activity of societies in support of democratic Greece which were established in certain parts of Bulgaria. Cases of collecting money and clothes are cited.

There exist indeed pro-democratic Greece societies in our country, as well as in many other countries. But it is well known that the sole activity of these societies is to express sympathy for the democratic Greek people and to alleviate the sufferings of the unfortunate Greek refugees. The entire activity of these societies is in the hands of the Bulgarian Red Cross. Relief is given only to Greek refugees and never to "Greek partisans", as UNSCOB maintains in its report. Such are the facts and no honest man could possibly qualify such aid and sympathy of the Bulgarian people toward the suffering Greek people as an illicit and unlawful intervention in the internal affairs of Greece.

In the second place, UNSCOB accuses Bulgaria of having given shelter and medical aid to Greek partisans. It is true that there have been cases of Greek partisans seeking shelter in Bulgaria. In such cases the Bulgarian authorities have merely applied strictly the rules, established by international law and customs, disarming and interning them in the interior of the country. Sick and wounded were also interned after being given medical aid, which is the human duty of every civilized nation.

In the third place, UNSCOB accuses Bulgaria of having allowed and abetted Greek partisans who had entered Bulgarian territory to return to Greece. This accusation is not supported by any serious proofs, and the evidence on which they are based is, as we shall see, more than dubious. Who are indeed these witnesses? The provisional report, made on December 31, 1947, shows that many of the witnesses were questioned by Greek military authorities. Every one can appreciate the validity of such evidence. Neither would anyone accord any evincive force to the evidence of witnesses who are not even identified but merely figure in the protocols of the observers' teams under certain signs, such as witness III 2 A or witness 6 W 68.

Just like in 1947, so in 1948 the witnesses used by the Greek authorities for fabricating accusations against the northern neighbors of Greece belong to two categories. The first comprises agents in the service of the Greek Secret Police or people whose life depends on the Greek authorities. The other is enlisted from among the numerous war criminals for whom Greece is "the paradise of collaborationists" (I quote the newspaper *Vima*, organ of Sofoulis). There are also new witnesses who were recommended to UNSCOB by the Greek authorities (among them are 26 "non-Greek refugees" of Bulgarian origin — see page 15 of the report). How could a person rely on people capable of betraying their country and of spreading monstrous slander about their nation and their people?

The report cites UNSCOB's resolution of August 12th, 1948 which recommends that in cases where partisans crossed into their territory, the Bulgarian, Albanian, and Yugoslav governments should immediately disarm them, if they carry arms, and intern them in camps where they should not be allowed to carry out any political or military activity. I wish to state that this is exactly what the Bulgarian authorities did; hence, they have

in no way violated the obligations of a government.

In these flippant accusations against Bulgaria, UNSCOB cites the existence of a camp of Greek refugees in the town of Berkovitsa, but does it in a way which leaves the impression that Bulgarian territory is used as a base for incursions into Greece. I wish to recall here, however, that the representative of the Greek government also tried last year to speculate with the Berkovitsa camp by presenting the whole thing so as if something mysterious were happening there. He reiterated the same assertions at one of the Investigation Commission's sessions which took place in Sofia in March 1947. The Bulgarian delegation proposed then that a team of Commission members visit Berkovitsa and verify on the spot the true state of affairs. The Commission, however, considered this superfluous and paid no attention to the assertions of the Greek representative who, on his part, deemed it wise not to insist. It is strange indeed that UNSCOB is now trying to revive the legend about this camp by basing itself primarily on the biased evidence of Bulgarian refugees. In reality, the existence of this camp in which, along with ordinary refugees, Greek

partisans are interned far from exposing the Bulgarian Government, confirms its loyalty. The Berkovitsa camp about which, as we read on § 178 of the report, "there is no evidence whatever of military training", was visited by some foreigners, none of whom accused the Bulgarian Government of disloyalty.

I now wish to talk about the UNSCOB assertion regarding the arms of the Greek partisans. In its first report on this question, it writes: "The Commission feels that Greek partisans have been receiving aid from Albania, Bulgaria and Yugoslavia". As we see, it is no more than an impression. This, however, does not stop the Commission from firmly concluding, a bit further down in its report, that this "aid was given with the knowledge of the Albanian, Bulgarian and Yugoslav Governments."

Both reports of UNSCOB are replete with contradictions and incongruities. Thus, for instance, we read: "From the evidence submitted no positive conclusions can be drawn about the origin of the armaments (referring to the armaments of the Greek partisans, acting in Western Thrace). But the quantity of mortar bombs and mines, used by the partisans in this remote mountain zone, necessarily leads one to the assumption that their origin lies outside

Greece". Is it not preposterous that a commission acting on behalf of the U. N. should refer merely to assumptions on which it bases the most serious accusations against one or more nations?

Further, on page 22 of its supplementary report, UNSCOB states that there existed "strong evidence" that the Bulgarian authorities accorded facilities to the partisans in their tactical movements by allowing them to cross the boundary and seek refuge on Bulgarian territory. However, it is not clear from the report what this "strong evidence" is, nor how it could have convinced the Commission that such movements of the partisans occurred with the knowledge and consent of the Bulgarian authorities. Our surprise is all the more justified by the fact that only a few lines above we read in the report: "It is possible that they (the Bulgarian troops) were aware of the partisans' movements and plans, but no explicit conclusions can be made on this point."

On what then does the Commission base its conviction that the Bulgarian authorities collaborated with the partisans? It is quite possible that in certain cases Greek partisans during an engagement have retreated into Bulgaria along the border lines just as Greek Government

troops have also penetrated into Bulgarian territory. But in all such cases the Bulgarian frontier guards have intervened to defend the inviolability of the Bulgarian territory. Whereas the Commission considers similar actions on the part of the Greek Government forces as absolutely normal and seeks to explain them in terms of the situation of the Greek troops (page 26), when it is a question of frontier violations by partisans, it attempts to establish premeditation and complicity on the part of the Bulgarian authorities. The bias of the Commission becomes immediately obvious from these two diametrically opposed appraisals of identical cases.

UNSCOB deemed it necessary to formulate also other accusations against Bulgaria, one of which refers to the "abduction of Greek children" and the other to the question of the re-establishment of diplomatic relations between Bulgaria and Greece.

It is not clear in how far the Bulgarian Government has sinned by giving refuge to a certain number of Greek children, victims of the chaotic situation in Greece, in order to save them from hunger, diseases and misery.

In spite of all material difficulties with which the Bulgarian Govern-

ment has to cope in order to feed its own population, it considered it a human duty to give shelter to fleeing Greek children as well as to other Greek refugees among whom there were a considerably number of old people and women.

The total number of Greek children, sheltered in Bulgaria, is 2412, of which 550 are under 6 years and the rest - between 6 and 14. The children are put up in 12 lodgings under the supervision of Greek teachers, men and women. What else could the Bulgarian Government have done?

As to the failure of the attempts to establish normal diplomatic relations between Bulgaria and Greece, I would like to recall that the Bulgarian Government did all it possibly could to facilitate the solution of this question. In reply to the communication, delivered through the British Government, that the Greek Government was ready to start negotiations for the re-establishment of diplomatic relations with Bulgaria and taking into consideration the desire of UN, expressed by its General Assembly, the Bulgarian Government suggested a meeting between the Bulgarian and Greek diplomatic representatives in Washington who would establish the conditions to this end.

This initiative of the Bulgarian Government, however, remained fruitless, because the Greek representative refused to clarify certain preliminary questions which would have helped prepare the ground for the re-establishment of diplomatic relations.

Only recently, in May 1948, the Athens Government, through the mediation of the French Government, modified its attitude and agreed to negotiate. But what were its proposals?

In the first place, it demanded that the Bulgarian Government give guarantees that it would no longer aid the Greek partisans. This should be a precondition for starting negotiations. It is not necessary to point out the obviously provocative character of such a demand. By putting forward such a demand, the Greek Government attempted: (1) to conceal the immense number of Greek border provocations by switching the blame on the Bulgarian Government and (2) to maneuver the Bulgarian Government into inferentially admitting the false accusation that it accorded military aid to the Greek partisans.

In spite of the non-existence of diplomatic relations between the two countries, the Bulgarian Government has always shown readiness to collaborate with the Greek

authorities in settling the frontier incidents. Way back in 1946, on March 11th, the Bulgarian Government informed the Allied Control Commission in Bulgaria that it agreed to re-enforce the Greco-Bulgarian Frontier Convention of 1931 about which there is a reference in the UNSCOB report (page 10). The Athens Government, however, did not accept then the suggestion made by the British military authorities in Greece. Much later, on May 14th 1948, the British Legation in Sofia conveyed the desire of the Greek Government for the re-establishment of the 1931 Frontier Convention. In its reply the Bulgarian Government stated that it would not oppose the conclusion of an agreement for settling the border incidents, which agreement should be adapted to the present conditions.

In practice, the Bulgarian authorities often resorted to direct contact with the respective Greek authorities for the settling of incidents, and I must declare that in certain cases satisfactory results were attained. Do these indisputable facts not speak for the good will of the Bulgarian Government in this case? UNSCOB itself has pointed out "certain efforts on Bulgarian side to respect the border regulations" (Page 22).

In this context I wish to point out that the UNSCOB accusations against Bulgaria as well as against Greece's other neighbors are basically of the same character as those which led to the appointment of the Inquiry Commission by the Security Council at the end of 1946. This Commission met in Athens on January 30th 1947 and for over two months made a most thorough on the spot investigation of all the questions brought up before it. As a result of these investigations, the Commission found it impossible to blame Bulgaria for any serious deviation from its international obligations.

In his speech of September 28th 1948 the representative of the Athens Government wisely avoided to mention the material collected by the Inquiry Commission in February and March 1947. On the other hand, he quoted at length the UNSCOB reports and did not miss the occasion to express his respect for its "absolute impartiality". It becomes even more obvious for what aims UNSCOB is being used and what purposes its obviously unfounded and biased reports serve. The quotations made were necessary to Mr. Tsaldaris for his conclusion that the situation "on the borderlines" had become "exceedingly serious", for which he natur-

ally blamed Greece's northern neighbors, including Bulgaria.

Mr. Tsaldaris makes an appeal to the UN General Assembly. He demands that "appropriate measures" be taken against the neighbors of Greece. He wishes the situation of chaos and war in Greece to engulf also its neighbors. He would like others to forget that this is Bulgarian territory against which Greek Government troops launch attacks and provocations.

The Bulgarian Government has addressed to the UN Secretariat 152 complaints and communications on violations of our border line and other border incidents, provoked by the Greeks. The Bulgarian army has been considerably reduced. We have no fleet. Our insignificant aviation serves only defensive purposes. The Athens Government, on the other hand, maintains a big army, amply supplied from abroad with modern weapons. Greece also has a large fleet and aviation. There are foreign troops in Greece as well. Is it not absurd then to maintain under these conditions that Bulgaria constitutes a threat to Greece's territorial integrity and independence? Is it not impertinent on the part of a government, which is unable to restore order and peace in its own country and to satisfy the needs of its people, to recommend measures

of compulsion and coercion against a country like Bulgaria which is imbued with a peaceful spirit and devoted to peaceful construction?

I wish to stress here that the Bulgarian Government is greatly surprised at the manner in which UNSCOB, acting on behalf of the United Nations, has prepared its reports. The latter are not of a nature to give a true picture of the actual situation in the Balkans. On the contrary, they attempt to divert the attention from the real nature of the Greek tragedy, from its deep roots, in order to give us a distorted view of the problem. Consequently, even UNSCOB's recommendations are not liable to contribute to the amelioration and normalization of international relations in this sector.

I must recall here that at the beginning of 1947 the Inquiry Commission appointed by the Security Council and to which I have already referred investigated most carefully on the spot all questions connected with the domestic situation of Greece and with the tension along Greece's northern frontier. This Commission collected abundant and verified data which made it perfectly clear that the root of the evil lies in the existing anti-democratic regime in Greece, and not in any spurious intervention in Greece's domestic affairs by its northern

neighbors. Nothing has changed in this respect since then. Unfortunately UNSCOB, acting — as I already explained — under abnormal conditions which raised a new barrier to the impartiality of its work, instead of investigating the true cause of the crisis deemed it useful to level serious, unfounded and unjust accusations against Bulgaria and the other northern neighbors of Greece.

UNSCOB drew bold, very bold, inferences which do not even comply with the headings of its previous reports.

In its principal report of July 30th 1948 UNSCOB, expressing its conviction that it could assist the governments of Albania, Bulgaria and Yugoslavia, on the one side, and that of Greece, on the other, "in the interest of all concerned to peacefully settle their disputes", recommends to the General Assembly to discuss, "the ways and means which should be applied to establish collaboration between Albania, Bulgaria and Yugoslavia and UNSCOB."

In its supplementary report of September 10th, however, UNSCOB, abandons in an inexplicable manner its role of conciliator, sees in the attitude of Albania, Bulgaria and Yugoslavia a threat to the "political independence and territorial in-

tegrity of Greece and to peace in the Balkans" and recommends serious and unilateral measures against Bulgaria, Albania and Yugoslavia.

One may well ask what has happened between June 30th and September 10th 1948 to induce UNSCOB to give up its role of conciliator and to radically change its standpoint on the Greek problem?

In the supplementary report there are no data warranting such a change. On the contrary, the data of this report are of a nature to weaken the conclusions and recommendations of UNSCOB in its principal report. If UNSCOB had sought the truth, it would have easily established that Bulgaria was not in the least threatening the Greek people, their independence or territory. If Balkan peace and order are threatened, this does not stem from the peaceful and loyal attitude of Bulgaria, a land completely engrossed in its economic and cultural development, but exclusively from the state of affairs in Greece, from the bloody struggle which the Greek people lead against a government maintained in power by an alien force after suppression of the Varkisa agreement of February 1945.

Bulgaria has given and gives innumerable proofs of its sincere

desire to maintain friendly relations with the Greek people. It is vitally interested in maintaining a lasting peace in the Balkans. The unstable situation in Greece causes it many difficulties and complications. It causes deep concern to the Bulgarian army, the number of which has already been cut down to the extent provided for in the Peace Treaty, and compels it to take all necessary defensive measures in order to control the frontier and to avert provocations which are so frequent, as is already known to UN from the numerous communications made by the Bulgarian Government.

147 such provocations and border incidents have taken place from March 1947 to September 1948. I have the honor to present to you in an annex a full list of these incidents which must be carefully studied for the sake of establishing the truth. I must add that in this list there are 54 cases of violations of Bulgarian airspace by planes coming from Greece. I shall confine myself here only to three cases, two of which were mentioned during the debates.

On April 4, 1948, at about 12 o'clock, on the upper island of the Maritsa river, south-west of the village Generalovo, Svilengrad district, a group of about 100 gendarmes and soldiers of the Greek army attacked

a Bulgarian patrol composed of Ivan Miladinov Ivanov, non-commissioned officer, and privates Kiril Bogdanov Christov and Ivan Popov Petrov, whom they abducted into Greek territory. This abduction was preceded by a strong charge against the Bulgarian patrol. This fact was proven by the great number of rifle and machine gun cartridges of Greek origin which were found at the very spot. Investigation which was carried out on the spot proved that the Bulgarian frontier guards had been captured and deported to Greek territory. On April 6th and 7th Bulgarian and Greek officers met in connection with this incident and on April 28th the UNSCOB's investigation team No 6 carried out on the spot investigations. The bodies of the non-commissioned officer and of one private were found later in the Maritsa river. The medical examination established that the non-commissioned officer was strangled before being thrown into the river. As to the third Bulgarian soldier, according to information of the Bulgarian authorities, his body was found by the Greek authorities in the lower course of Maritsa and buried without informing the Bulgarian Government.

Secondly, mention is made of the two incidents in the region of Belasitsa mountain last August. About

these incidents it is stated here that fire was opened from Bulgarian territory towards Greek territory and that two UNSCOB observers were wounded. According to the information of the Bulgarian authorities, between the 5th and 8th of August 1948 a battle took place between Greek Government troops and Greek partisans on Belasitsa mountain in Greek territory and not far from the frontier. During these clashes on August 5th two companies of Greek Government troops opened fire against the Bulgarian patrol south of Kolarovo village, district of Petrich, wounding the Bulgarian soldier Stefan Alexandrov Berlinski and then abducting him into Greek territory. On August 6th Greek Government troops opened artillery fire, using also mine-throwers, in the direction of Bulgarian territory in the district of Belasitsa. Shells and mines fell on Bulgarian territory about 2 kilometres from the village of Eleshnitsa, Petrich district.

The Bulgarian Government has informed the UN Secretariat, expressing its protest against the incident of August 5th with the abduction of the Bulgarian soldier by Greek Government troops. It also informed the Secretariat about the incidents I just mentioned. The Bulgarian Government, however, has received no communication from the

UN Secretariat or UNSCOB about any incident on August 6th, 1948, when two members of an observation team of UNSCOB are said to have been wounded.

Nor have the Bulgarian authorities been informed that a plane with Bulgarian marks opened fire with its guns against Greek Government troops in the region of Belasitsa on August 17th 1948. There did occur a serious incident on that date. Greek Government troops, about one infantry regiment strong and equipped with artillery, occupied the heights along the frontier, south-west of the village of Chakalarovo, after which they penetrated into Bulgarian territory. There ensued a skirmish, lasting several hours, after which the Greek troops withdrew into Greek territory.

As regards the violation of the Bulgarian airspace, the most recent incidents occurred on September 26th, 1948, when at 3 p. m. four fighter planes coming from Greece opened up fire against the Bulgarian frontier guard some four km. south-west of the village of Kozhare, district of Devin. As a result of this attack the frontier post was set on fire and occupied by Greek Government troops.

These cases eloquently show the character of the incidents on the

Bulgaro-Greek frontier and who provoked them.

In this context I must state that the Bulgarian Government is deeply surprised at the way in which UNSCOB seeks to present these provocations (page 26 of the supplementary report). It is quite incompatible with its high functions, and practically constitutes a direct encouragement to the Greek authorities to continue to act in the same spirit. This way of exposing facts fully justifies the reservations formulated by the Bulgarian Government, with respect to UNSCOB from its very inception.

Our attitude can be explained not only by the fact that Bulgaria, as non-member of the UN, did not participate on an equal footing in the creation of this Commission, but also by the circumstance that UNSCOB was created under conditions infringing on our national sovereignty. Moreover, the refusal of two member-nations of the Security Council to be represented on UNSCOB did not tend to guarantee in our eyes the impartiality of its work. That is why Bulgaria, although it highly respects the UN, was compelled to formulate serious reservations with respect to UNSCOB.

It should not be concluded, however, from the reservations made with respect to UNSCOB and its work that the Bulgarian Government does not wish to cooperate with the UN or to respect its decisions. Bulgaria has given numerous proofs of its will to cooperate with this high international institution. The Bulgarian Government has participated in numerous international conferences and meetings, convened under its auspices, and cannot be accused of disloyalty towards the UN. As it is known, it also took part, from the beginning to the end, in the UN Inquiry Commission and lent all facilities for the execution of its tasks.

The Bulgarian Government showed its readiness to cooperate with UNSCOB whenever there was a concrete occasion and on condition that its sovereign rights and national dignity be not violated. Thus, for instance, the Bulgarian Government gave its consent to an investigation on Bulgarian territory in connection with the serious frontier incident near the Maritsa river, as was stressed in the report of the Secretary General to the General Assembly. Imbued with the same desire, the Bulgarian Government dispatched last year to Salonika a representative with the task of contacting UNSCOB. But the demands it made were in

practice tantamount to imposing a control on our country and revealed to our Government the erroneous conception UNSCOB has about its role and mandate. This erroneous conception, by the way, attracted also the attention of the Australian delegation which, both in the principal and the preliminary reports, expressed a minority opinion on the question of the UNSCOB mandate and its functions and made reservations with regard to its conclusions and recommendations.

Mr. Chairman, I expounded before you the attitude of the Bulgarian Government on the problem submitted to the attention of the Political Committee. I would like to stress once more, however, that the Committee's refusal to grant Bulgaria the legal right to participate on an equal footing in the discussions of a dispute to which it is a side is contrary both to the general principles of law and to the spirit and letter of the UN Charter. On the other hand, this procedure is not of a nature to help establish normal relations in the Balkans. There is no doubt that one of the indispensable conditions for normalizing the situation in the Balkans is to treat all nations of that peninsula on a basis of perfect equality.

This procedure as well as the already mentioned method of work

of UNSCOB increase still more our doubt that it is possible to take correct decisions on the Greek problem under such conditions. The Bulgarian Government categorically rejects the accusations formulated against Bulgaria in the UNSCOB report as totally unfounded. I wish to stress in this context that Bulgaria has in no way deviated from its international obligations, that it has in no way violated the interests of peace in the Balkans. It sincerely hopes that the internal disorders which are tearing Greece asunder will stop and that the Greek people will regain their liberty to settle their future as they choose. This is bound to have repercussions on the pacification of the spirits in the Balkans. However, it cannot be done in the way suggested by the representative of the Athens Government here two days ago. Everybody, including Mr. Pipinelis, knows that this truly tragic Greek problem with which the UN is again faced has its neuralgic point not along Greece's northern frontier, but in the very interior of that country, in Athens, in the Peloponnesus, in Macedonia.

in Thessaly, all along the Greek territory, and under conditions existing there.

We trust that UN will finally seek a solution to the Greek problem in this sense in accordance with its real nature so that it may cease to be the source of sufferings, disorders, and threats to peace.

The Bulgarian Government also hopes that it will finally be granted the legal right to take its place among the United Nations. In this way the Bulgarian people will be enabled to add their efforts to the efforts of all peace-loving and democratic peoples for the triumph of the lofty principles of peace and international cooperation. Bulgaria believes in the positive role of the UN and sincerely wishes to cooperate in the realization of its aims.

In conclusion, I'll state that the People's Republic of Bulgaria is a peace-loving and sovereign nation which accepts all obligations contained in the UN Charter and is able and willing to carry out these obligations.

[illegible]

MINISTRY OF FOREIGN AFFAIRS
DIRECTION OF THE PRESSE

IN-THE-20TH-CENTURY-----0172047-----

UNIVERSITY LIBRARY



HX 632 A1 W9 no.84

World communism in the 20th
century.

0172047A MAIN

